UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/569,793	02/27/2006	Toshiyuki Kanai	040894-7413	6625
9629 MORGAN LE	7590 12/12/200 WIS & BOCKIUS LLP	EXAMINER		
1111 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW			LOPEZ, MICHELLE	
WASHINGTON, DC 20004		•	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3721	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/12/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
•	10/569,793	KANAI ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Michelle Lopez	3721			
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REWHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication of NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by some any reply received by the Office later than three months after the nearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	G DATE OF THIS COMMUNI R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a n. eriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOR tatute, cause the application to become A	CATION. reply be timely filed  NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2	?7 November 2007.				
· —	,				
3) Since this application is in condition for allo					
closed in accordance with the practice und	ier <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D	). 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-4 and 7-11</u> is/are pending in the	application.				
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with	drawn from consideration.				
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-4 and 7-11</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction ar	nd/or election requirement.				
Application Papers					
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Exan	niner.				
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)		by the Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to		•			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the con	rrection is required if the drawing	(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attached	d Office Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of:	eign priority under 35 U.S.C. §	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).			
1. Certified copies of the priority docum					
2. Certified copies of the priority docum		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
3. Copies of the certified copies of the		received in this National Stage			
application from the International But  * See the attached detailed Office action for a	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	ivad			
See the attached detailed Office action for a	ist of the certified copies flot	received.			
Attachment(s)	_				
1)		Summary (PTO-413) s)/Mail Date			
<ul> <li>Rotice of Braitsperson's Fatent brawing Neview (F10-940)</li> <li>Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)</li> <li>Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/16/07,11/27/07.</li> </ul>		nformal Patent Application			

Art Unit: 3721

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

New claims 9-11 have been added.

# Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/27/07 has been entered.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4 and 7-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olesen et al. 4,573,625 in view of Sesek et al 6,923,360.

Olesen discloses a stapler comprising a cartridge 90 with staple members in a straight shape 94, a striking portion formed with a striking path, a magazine 32, a staple supply mechanism formed in the magazine as shown in Figs. 9-10, a forming plate 70 that forms the staple member in a c-shape, a driver plate 80, a clincher mechanism that folds and bends a leg of the staple member as shown in Figs. 5-6, a movable anvil via 60, a staple guide via 507 that guides the connected staples to the striking portion (fig. 17 and 21; col. 11, lines 37-53), and a fixed anvil via 508, 509 formed at front end portion of the staple guide (claim 1); the driver plate

10/569,793

Art Unit: 3721

80 and the forming plate 70 are operated on a same plane (claim 2); wherein the forming plate is formed by a plate member with legs 72 having a thickness substantially as claimed and wherein the driver plate is formed by a plate member having a thickness at 180 substantially the same as a width dimension of a section of the staple member (claim 3); and wherein the striking portion is formed at a front end of 102 of the cartridge 90 (claim 4); wherein the fixed anvil 508 protrudes into a plane in which the forming plate moves up and down as shown in fig. 21 (claim 9); a recess portion 77 formed on the forming plate 70, wherein the driver 86 is contained in said recess portion as shown in figs. 10-11 (claim 10); and wherein a width of the movable anvil 60 is smaller than a width of the fixed anvil as shown in fig. 20 (claim 11).

With respect to claims 1 and 7-8, it has been held that the recitation that an element is "capable" of performing a function is not a positive limitation but only requires the ability to so perform. It does not constitute a limitation in any patentable sense. In re Hutchison, 69 USPQ 138. Therefore, little consideration has been given to the limitation of "wherein the forming plate is capable of forming the staple member ... and the staple member which is successive to the staple member above the movable anvil simultaneously" in claim 1 and to "the forming plate is capable of simultaneously forming the staple member which is arranged above the movable anvil ... and a staple member which is arranged on the fixed anvil". Furthermore, the functional language is no supported by sufficient structure to perform the forming of two staples simultaneously.

Alternatively, Sesek teaches the concept of stapler having a forming plate and anvil member which form more than one staple at a time as 42 (see col. 12, lines 6-24) for the purpose of minimizing a force required to drive the staples into a stack of papers. It would have been

obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to have modified Olesen's forming plate to be capable of forming two staple simultaneously as taught by Sesek in order to provided a multiple-preformed staple which minimize the force required to drive the staples into a stack of papers.

# Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant arguments asserting that the finality of the Office Action dated August 8, 2007 is premature because it introduces a new ground of rejection not necessitated by applicant's amendment, Examiner disagrees and asserts that the new ground of rejection was necessitated by applicant's amendment to claim 7 and new added claim 8 filed on 4/6/07.

Also, in response to applicant's argument that Olesen does not disclose or suggest the ability to form two staple at once, a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim.

### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michelle Lopez whose telephone number is 571-272-4464. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday: 8:00 am - 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rinaldi Rada can be reached on 571-272-4467. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

10/569,793

Art Unit: 3721

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1006.

/ML/

**Patent Examiner** 

Rinaldi I. Rada

Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3700